

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,777	02/16/2005	Toshifumi Yoshikawa	056205.55944US	8697
23911 7590 06/08/2007 CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			EXAMINER	
			CAVALLARI, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	
				DELIVERY MODE
		,	06/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) Advisory Action 10/524,777 YOSHIKAWA ET AL. Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief Examiner Art Unit Daniel J. Cavallari 2836 --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 23 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. \square The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **NOTICE OF APPEAL** 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) X will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of

13. Other: ____.

Claim(s) allowed: _____ Claim(s) objected to: ___ Claim(s) rejected: ____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be

showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

11. \(\subseteq \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and

entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a

how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ____

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendments add new limitations which require new consideration and search. Specifically, Claim 6 recites the new limitation of "...and the plurality of leads..." and Claim 8 recites new limitations of "...before the interruption of the electric service begins...." In regard to the applicants argument that Kern fails to teach "issuing a command signal..." the Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that the "command signal" from the display screen (60) originates from the user who controls the display screen (60) and issues the appropriate commands to the different "control units" as described in the rejection of 12/28/2006. The applicant further argues that "issuing a command signal... before the interruption of the electric service..." is not taught by Kern. The Examiner notes that the claim recites "...adjusting the power generation amount, before the interruption of the electric service begins in the case where service interruption information is provided in advance..." thereby not limiting to issuing a command before an interruption when the service interruption is not known in advance. The applicant further argues that Kern fails to teach "first control unit adjusting the load amounts of the loads based on rated power consumption of each lead and the present load amount of each load..." The Examiner points out that each load has an inherent "rated power consumption" which may or may not be the actual or instantaneous power or "present load amount". Kern teach determining the present load amount which is inherently dependant on the "rated power consumption" of the load.

MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800